

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,491	01/28/2004	Richard L. Guldi	TI 36326	3492
23494 7	7590 09/15/2005		EXAMINER	
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED			LEE, CALVIN	
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999 DALLAS, TX 75265			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DALLAS, 1A	13203		2818	

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Δ
1	7
V	U

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Commons	10/766,491	GULDI et al.	
Office Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit	
	Lee, Calvin	2818	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	app ars on the cover shet wi	th th correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re eply within the statutory minimum of thirt od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed r (30) days will be considered timely. I'HS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Au	igust 29, 2005 (Election).		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ TI	his action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow			
closed in accordance with the practice unde	i Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D	. 11, 433 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-20 is/are withdrest is/are allowed. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exami 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 28 January 2004 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ o he drawing(s) be held in abeyan ection is required if the drawing(ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a life.	ents have been received. ents have been received in A riority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)	∧ □	Numman/ /PTO 442\	
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/C Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Ir 6) Other:	formal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

Application: 10/766,491 Page 2
Docket No: TI 36326 GULDI et al.

OFFICE ACTION

Response to Election

1. The withdrawn of claims 15-20 in the Response to Restriction (without traverse), received on August 29, 2005 is acknowledged. Pending claims 1-14 are subjected for the rejections below.

Claims Objections

2. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-12 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1 lines 4 and 7, claim 2 line 3, claim 4 line 3, claim 5 line 3, claim 6 line 3, claim 9 line 2

(both materials), claim 10 line 2, claim 11 line 2 & claim 12 line 2, replace "material" with --seed
Claim 4 line 2, claim 5 line 2, claim 6 line 2, and claim 8 line 2, replace "seed" with --barrier--

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

- 3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language
- 4. Claims 1-7 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by *Chikarmane et al* (US 2003/0034251).
- a) In re claim 1, *Chikarmane et al* teaches an electroplating process, comprising the step of forming a thin layer 18 of oxide (i.e., CuO₂) on a seed layer 17 overlying a substrate 20 [Fig. 1d].

Since Chikarmane et al discloses the process (i.e., steps 210 thru 240) "done in copper-barrier seed tool" [Fig. 2a], Chikarmane et al inherently teaches or suggest that the tool/enclosure

Page 3

Application: 10/766,491

Docket No: TI 36326 GULDI et al.

is substantially devoid of unwanted contaminants because the disclosed high vacuum chamber/enclosure 320 allows no airborne substances from entering into it [¶ 0033].

- b) In re claim 2, *Chikarmane et al* discloses removing the substrate from the enclosure and placing the substrate in an electroplating solution [Fig. 2b].
- c) In re claim 3, *Chikarmane et al* suggests the electroplating solution being a copper electroplating solution [¶ 0042].
- d) In re claim 4, *Chikarmane et al* discloses forming a barrier layer 16 prior to forming a seed layer 17 [step 230 of Fig. 2a].
- e) In re claim 5, Chikarmane et al suggest the enclosure including three compartments, wherein the barrier layer is formed in a first compartment 312, the seed layer is formed in a second compartment 314, and the thin layer of oxide is formed in a third compartment 316 [¶ 0046].
- f) In re claim 6, although *Chikarmane et al* does not explicitly describe "said seed layer and said material layer are formed in a first compartment and said thin layer of oxide is formed in a second compartment," *Chikarmane et al* suggests "the cooper-barrier seed deposition tool **310** includes a plurality of chambers **312**, **314**, **316**, **318** that may be used for various phases of the process" [¶ 0046]. Therefore, *Chikarmane et al* inherently teaches or suggests the claim feature.
- g) In re claim 7, Chikarmane et al suggests seed layer 17 being a copper seed layer [¶ 0027].
- h) In re claim 10, *Chikarmane et al* discloses introducing pure oxygen into the enclosure, thereby forming the thin layer of cupric oxide [¶ 0031].
- i) In re claim 11, *Chikarmane et al* suggests the thin layer of oxide having a thickness of about 5-100Å (equivalent to 0.5-10nm) [¶ 0031].
- j) In re claim 12, Chikarmane et al also suggests [¶ 0031] forming the thin layer of oxide at a temperature of 15-20°C (within the claimed temperature ranging: -10°C to 150°C).

Application: 10/766,491 Page 4

Docket No: TI 36326 GULDI et al.

k) In re claim 13, as mentioned above, *Chikarmane et al* discloses the process (i.e., steps 210 thru 240) "done in copper-barrier seed tool" [Fig. 2a]. Hence, *Chikarmane et al* inherently teaches that the enclosure is substantially devoid of unwanted contaminants because the disclosed high vacuum enclosure/chamber allows no airborne substances from entering into it [¶ 0033]. The Examiner notes that in *Chikarmane et al* [¶ 0035] "a contamination removal chamber 322" supports the claimed "removing unwanted contaminants from the enclosure."

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office Action:
- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chikarmane et al, as applied to claim 1, in view of May et al (US 2005/0064708).

Chikarmane et al is silent about formation pressures of barrier and seed layers.

Nevertheless, such seed layer and barrier layer, and their formation pressures are known in the semiconductor processing art as evidenced by May et al disclosing a seed layer 202 formed at a low pressure of about 0.05 to 5mTorr [¶ 0036], and a barrier layer 306 formed at a pressure of about 0.5 to 5mTorr [¶ 0043].

It would have been obvious to one having skills in the art to have modified the formation of a seed layer and/or a barrier layer by utilizing low pressure(s) for the purpose of forming a seed and/or barrier layer having a uniform distribution of seed and/or barrier material [¶ 0042].

Application: 10/766,491 Page 5
Docket No: TI 36326 GULDI et al.

6. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chikarmane et al

in view of Lu et al (US 2005/0031876).

Chikarmane et al teaches eliminating unwanted contaminants to promote void-free electroplating gap-fill but not suggesting such contaminants consisted of moisture, volatile organics, and ionic radicals. Lu et al describes common organic surface contaminants comprising moisture, volatile organics, and hydroxyl radicals [¶ 0004].

It would have been obvious to one having skills in the art to have modified the contaminants by utilizing moisture, volatile organics, and ionic radicals, suggested by *Lu et al*, for the purpose of clarifying those unwanted but common contaminants, which are well-known in the semiconductor etching/cleaning processing art.

Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the Examiner should be directed to Calvin Lee at (571) 272-1896 on Mondays thru Thursdays 6:30-4:30 (EST). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, Art Unit 2818's Supervisory Patent Examiner David Nelms can be reached at (571) 272-1787. The central fax number for the organization (where this application is assigned to) is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system at http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center at (866) 217-9197.

Calvin Lee

calvulu